

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BLUEFIELD

ROBERT STONE,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:16-08775

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and recommendations ("PF&R") for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). (Doc. No. 4.)

Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his PF&R on October 26, 2016, in which he recommended that the Court deny Petitioner's Letter-Form Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. No. 2) and his form Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. No. 9); and remove this matter from the docket of the court.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted seventeen days in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's PF&R. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allotted constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court.

Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989). Neither party filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's PF&R within the required time period.

Accordingly, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Tinsley's PF&R as follows:

- 1) Petitioner's Letter-Form Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. No. 2) is **DENIED**;
- 2) Petitioner's form Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. No. 9) is **DENIED**; and
- 3) The Clerk is directed to remove this matter from the docket of the court.


Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683–84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing

standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and to Petitioner.

It is **SO ORDERED** this 20th day of March, 2017.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber
Senior United States District Judge